

1 J. DAVID HADDEN (CSB No. 176148)  
 dhadden@fenwick.com  
 2 SAINA S. SHAMILOV (CSB No. 215636)  
 sshamilov@fenwick.com  
 3 MELANIE L. MAYER (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 mmayer@fenwick.com  
 4 TODD R. GREGORIAN (CSB No. 236096)  
 tgregorian@fenwick.com  
 5 RAVI R. RANGANATH (CSB No. 272981)  
 rranganath@fenwick.com  
 6 CHIEH TUNG (CSB No. 318963)  
 ctung@fenwick.com  
 7 TJ FOX (CSB No. 322938)  
 tfox@fenwick.com  
 8 FENWICK & WEST LLP  
 Silicon Valley Center  
 9 801 California Street  
 Mountain View, CA 94041  
 10 Telephone: 650.988.8500  
 Facsimile: 650.938.5200

11  
 12 Counsel for AMAZON.COM, INC.,  
 13 AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC., and  
 TWITCH INTERACTIVE, INC.  
 14  
 15  
 16

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

17 IN RE: PERSONAL WEB TECHNOLOGIES,  
 LLC ET AL., PATENT LITIGATION

Case No.: 5:18-md-02834-BLF

18 AMAZON.COM, INC., and AMAZON WEB  
 SERVICES, INC.,

Case No.: 5:18-cv-00767-BLF

19 Plaintiffs

Case No.: 5:18-cv-05619-BLF

20 v.  
 21 PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC and  
 LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

**SECOND NOTICE OF AMAZON.COM,  
INC., AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.,  
AND TWITCH INTERACTIVE, INC.  
RE MOTION FOR ATTORNEY  
FEES AND COSTS**

22 Defendants,  
 23 PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES, LLC, and  
 LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC,

Dept: Courtroom 3, 5th Floor  
 Judge: Hon. Beth L. Freeman

24 Plaintiffs,  
 25 v.

26 TWITCH INTERACTIVE, INC.,  
 27 Defendant.

1           At the August 6, 2020 hearing on the motion for attorney fees and costs, the Court asked  
 2 whether Amazon sought an exceptional case finding against both PersonalWeb Technologies LLC  
 3 and Level 3 Communications LLC. Dkt. 628 (8/6/20 Tx. at 21:11-20).

4           While it appeared as a co-Plaintiff with PersonalWeb, Level 3 took the position throughout  
 5 the case that it had in fact asserted no claims. Dkt. 175, ¶ 3 (“All infringement allegations, state-  
 6 ments describing PersonalWeb, statements describing any Defendant (or any Defendant’s products)  
 7 and any statements made regarding jurisdiction and venue are made by PersonalWeb alone, and  
 8 not by Level 3.”). After retaining separate outside counsel (*see* Dkts. 366, 383-85, & 426), Level  
 9 3 made only two substantive filings in the case. In the first, it refused the Court’s request to provide  
 10 a position as to whether Amazon’s CloudFront product fell within Level 3’s exclusive field of use  
 11 under the Kinetech-Digital Island Agreement. *See* Dkt. 429 at 1:16-26. In the second, it gave  
 12 notice that PersonalWeb had commenced a related arbitration against it. Dkt. 465.

13           Amazon and Twitch did not specify in their notice of motion against which parties they  
 14 sought a fee award (Dkt. 593 at 1), but the motion did not identify the above conduct as part of the  
 15 reason the Court should find the case exceptional, and the proposed order was directed to Person-  
 16 alWeb. Dkt. 592-18 (“PersonalWeb is ordered to pay \$\_\_\_\_\_ in attorney fees and  
 17 expenses incurred by Amazon and Twitch in defending PersonalWeb’s claims in this multidistrict  
 18 litigation and in the individual cases that comprise it.”). The majority rule under Rule 54 provides  
 19 that the district court has discretion to apportion liability for fees as it sees fit. *See, e.g., Ortho-*  
 20 *McNeil Pharm., Inc. v. Mylan Labs. Inc.*, 569 F.3d 1353, 1357 & n.4 (Fed. Cir. 2009) (noting “the  
 21 default rule is that the losing parties are jointly and severally liable for costs,” but that “the district  
 22 court has discretion to apportion payment of jointly incurred costs among the losing parties . . .”);  
 23 *Anderson v. Griffin*, 397 F.3d 515, 522-23 (7th Cir. 2005) (“The cases say that the presumptive rule  
 24 [for how to divide costs between the parties] is joint and several liability unless it is clear that one  
 25 or more of the losing parties is responsible for a disproportionate share of the costs”). But given  
 26 the limited role of Level 3 in this case, Amazon and Twitch wish to clarify their response at the  
 27 hearing and confirm that, while “exceptional case” is determined from the totality of the circum-  
 28 stances, their motion seeks a fee award as against PersonalWeb Technologies and not Level 3.

1 Dated: August 14, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

2 FENWICK & WEST LLP

3

4 By: /s/ J. David Hadden

5 J. DAVID HADDEN (CSB No. 176148)

6 Counsel for AMAZON.COM, INC., AMAZON  
7 WEB SERVICES, INC., and TWITCH INTER-  
8 ACTIVE, INC.

FENWICK & WEST LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW